DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 147 305 80 SP 011 942

AUTHOR Andrews, Theodore E., Ed.
TITLE PBTE (Performance-Based Teacher Education); Vol, 2, No. 8, February 1974.
INSTITUTION Multi-State Consortium on Performance-Based Teacher Education, Albany, N.Y.
SPONS AGENCY Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE Feb 74
NOTE 9p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$1.67 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS College School Cooperation; *Consortia; *Organization; *Performance Based Education; *Performance Based Teacher Education; Professional Associations; *Program Planning
IDENTIFIERS *Collaboration; Oregon

ABSTRACT

This issue of the Multi-State Consortium on Performance-Based Teacher Education (PBTE) newsletter focuses on the role collaboration plays in competency-based education programs. A diagnostic test is presented to rate reader knowledge of ten basic concepts of collaboration, and the correct answers are discussed. Wendell C. Allen comments on the role of collaboration in teacher education; while the difficulties of college-school-professional organization cooperation are not overlooked, the benefits accruing from such effort are stressed. A report is made by Richard E. Collier on formal procedures through which policies were formulated and major recommendations were developed during the Undergraduate Urban Teacher Education Program in New York State. James M. Wallace discusses the evolving importance of performance-based education and performance-based teacher education in Oregon's educational environment and makes projections for the 1980's. (MJB)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED147305

P B T E

PERFORMANCE - BASED TEACHER EDUCATION

Published by the Multi-State Consortium on Performance-Based Teacher Education

Vol. 2, No. 8 February 1974

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

COLLABORATION!

PB0989

One of the themes in current educational thinking that has possibly the greatest potential, but little empirical data to support it, is collaboration. *One of the best materials PBTE has found dealing effectively with this area is the "Shared Decision Making: Professional Development Program," published by the Association of California School Administrators. The package includes training manuals and materials for persons interested in becoming involved with shared decision making. Included is an excellent annotated bibilography.*

PBTE is indebted to the Association of California School Administrators for permission to reprint the diagnostic test included in their materials. Readers may find it helpful to test their perceptions with this "pretest."

Persons interested in learning more about this training program should contact the Association of California School Administrators, Post Office Box 4361, Burlingame, California 94010, or phone (416) 629-4300. The program may be purchased for $15. The Association recommends that the package be used, for the first time at least, with a trainer or consultant.

DIAGNOSTIC TEST

Directions: Select the most appropriate answer and circle your choice. When the test is finished, compare the analysis of your responses with the correct answers at bottom of this page. See discussion on page 2.

1. The professional literature is adamant on the issue that all personalities can be members of shared decision making groups with sufficient and appropriate training. — True / False

2. Most institutions come close to putting into practice the personal values of staff members. — True / False

3. Most schools involved in shared decision making have made a careful analysis of personality characteristics and institutional values before engaging in shared decision making. — True / False

4. Individuals involved in shared decision making quickly learn to represent the best interests of the school rather than personal and/or departmental concerns. — True / False

5. There are instruments available to help administrators learn how much their personality indicates that they need to have control over other people. — True / False

6. The more people know about themselves, the more likely they are to be open in their communication with others. — True / False

7. Which of the following is considered the most difficult problem to initially confront (from empirical information sources consisting of representatives in schools where shared decision making is practiced)?

   A Difficulty in designing a decision making model
   B Difficulty in establishing an accountability system
   C Lack of trust between administrator and teachers
   D Lack of specific skills having to do with making decisions

8. All people have values; however, they seldom assess how closely their daily actions reflect their values. — True / False

9. For people to learn about themselves and their values, frequently they must give special thought and consideration to the issues. — True / False

10. From the empirical evidence it appears that considerable "lip service" is being paid to the shared decision making concept, but little may have actually been accomplished thus far. — True / False

Answers to Diagnostic Test

1.	False	6.	True
2.	False	7.	C
3.	False	8.	True
4.	False	9.	True
5.	True	10.	True

If you answered eight out of 10 questions correctly, you may bypass the following explanatory material.

SP011 942

Responses To Diagnostic Test

1. **FALSE.** Empirical evidence and research document the fact that some individuals cannot and do not perform well with others in groups. There is considerable research literature which indicates that some behaviors of adults can be changed — but most of this change is based upon an inner quality of openness that must be nurtured early in life. Apparently, however, there are some personalities that have become so closed over time that this proposed training will probably not cause lasting modifications in the individual's modus operandi.

Some personalities, it seems, must be fulfilled by having authority over others. In the case of principals, this may entail a need to operate a school as if it were a military vessel in which the principal is the proverbial captain of the ship.

This is not meant to imply that the behavior is totally negative — on the contrary, there are "benevolent" captains who have the real concerns of the crew at heart; however, such people are not well disposed to sharing power or authority.

2. **FALSE.** Some schools do a reasonably good job of this, but too often the philosophy of schools is so vague that it is difficult to establish a match between the individual values of people in the school and the school's institutional practices. Many schools have found that it has been necessary to establish a mid-position which accommodates some of the differing positions of the staff. Perhaps this is the reason that alternative schools or schools-within-a-school are becoming fashionable throughout the country, in that such schools may better accommodate the philosophy of specific groups within society.

3. **FALSE.** Apparently none of the schools we are familiar with made a very extensive study of personality characteristics and institutional values before engaging in shared decision making. Interestingly, from some of the empirical data available, it would seem that this factor has had as much to do with the success of shared decision making efforts as any other item has.

4. **FALSE.** It seems that one of the most difficult problems for members of a decision making group to overcome is the tendency to think parochially. That is, most members think of the role they play in personal terms — often there is more concern about individual and/or departmental interests than about what is best for children or the whole school. It is only after members of the group begin to realize that all factors need consideration, that more realistic perspectives are possible. One approach for getting to this more global understanding is to make certain that members of the decision making group have ample opportunities to interact with each other on a variety of formal and informal levels. Even relatively small school staffs are amazed at how little they know about each other as individual persons.

5. **TRUE.** There are at least three reasonably reliable instruments available to principals who may want to know themselves better — both from the vantage point of personally evaluating their operating style, and of gaining perspective on how others view their style. The FIRO B instrument is one that can be sel dministered privately. The LBDQ is an in..rument that a principal can use to obtain ratings for the staff as well as himself. By drawing two profiles, the principal is able to determine if staff members believe he is functioning in the style he believes he is. A mismatch is often very revealing to the principal. The Purdue Inventory is another instrument somewhat similar to the LBDQ, and is used in essentially the same manner. The latter two instruments are less easy to use for self-analysis, and thus require the assistance of an experienced outside person.

6. **TRUE.** Most of the psychological literature indicates that a person must know himself before he is able to know others well. When members of decision making groups have reached the position where they can disagree with an idea without confronting the person, there is a good chance of the group's being able to deal with complex issues. The greater the openness of the individuals' in the decision making group, the greater the possibility that substantive issues can be effectively addressed.

7. **C.** The other possible responses to this question have to do with operating procedures that must be dealt with and overcome, after trust levels are appropriately established, during the early stages of implementing shared decision making. The personality variable, however, having to do with the degree of trust between people, is often quite difficult to overcome because people find they are dealing with emotions, not with fact or rational elements. Unfortunately, because of the ways in which schools have been established in the past, because of the legal requirements of the principal, and because of other influences such as the increased militancy of teachers, there are obstacles that cause great difficulty when trustful relationships between teachers and administrators are attempted. Irrespective of the individual occupying the principal's chair, there is a tendency to look upon that role with expectations different from those for the teacher in the next room. Many problems can likely be solved when the personality factors have been resolved and reasonable levels of trust established.

8. **TRUE.** Undoubtedly each individual has values — although in daily practice he may act in ways that vary from what he believes. This variance may cause considerable cognitive dissonance; individuals then must mentally wrestle with themselves to continue functioning. Many people may try to reduce the discrepancy between real and ideal situations. Of help to these people is an opportunity to check one's values and to assess one's routine in terms of those values. For individuals to balance their lives reasonably well there must be some congruence between how they feel about themselves, their families, and their jobs. If one of these elements is markedly different, an individual usually finds his life is only partially fulfilled.

9. **TRUE.** Incredibly, in education we seldom legitimatize the right to think about ourselves. It is as if we are saying it is normal to study "the disciplines," but not to study ourselves and why we respond to various stimuli the way we do. For real self-study to occur, special occasions must be established giving tacit approval to such activity.

10. **TRUE.** From the empirical data it seems that both teachers and administrators in schools attempting shared decision making believe that "less" is happening than should be. Teachers often feel that the administration is paying lip service to the sharing concept, but that real decisions are made before they get to the decision making group. Thus the people in the group are being used as a rubber stamp.

On the other hand, administrators often feel that teachers talk about shared decision making but seldom get around to making a decision. Then when decisions are made, the group does not accept the responsibility and accountability for its decisions. A general observation tempering these points is "while everything isn't working as smoothly as we would like to have it, the method is worth continuing and we wouldn't want to go back to the old method." ■

Comments on Collaboration in Teacher Education

by

Wendell C. Allen

For more than a decade, Washington State has been engaged in an organized effort to improve the preparation of teachers. New state standards adopted by the State Board of Education in 1948 and revised in 1971 were an important step in this effort. These standards authorize consortia of colleges, professional associations, and common school administrations to plan and operate preparation programs.

Over the years of study, experimentation, and discussion from which this approach developed, the view grew that shared responsibility among these three groups, (which may be parties, agencies, institutions, or organizations) should promote a greatly strengthened foundation for the improvement of pre- and inservice teacher education. These three groups had in common a vital interest in the preparation of teachers. In order for a group to make its best contribution to preparation programs, the responsible participation of the other two groups was needed. Responsible participation in a joint enterprise requires collaboration — a mutual sharing in decision making with respect to the nature of programs, to responsibilities, and to evaluation.

Such joining of hands is a difficult task, which in large measure has had to be learned by doing. Some consortia began by working on programs; others worked first on the determination of organization and management structures. In each case the participants found themselves in a partnership setting, each with important contributions to make, with no one party dominant. The common denominator was a professional concern for teacher preparation. The essential element in collaboration proves to be respect for the views, as well as the rights and responsibilities, of the other collaborators.

The fact that teacher preparation is not the primary institutional function of common schools, colleges, or professional associations has a significant bearing on the nature, extent, and expression of the commitment each party makes to the collaborative effort. Commitment to a collaborative relationship has far-reaching implications which may not at first be fully realized by the participants. Development of collaborative programs is almost certain to be a difficult and time-consuming task; the process may reveal to one or more of the parties that the commitment called for is greater than either the desire or the ability of the group. The rewards of collaboration must be in program improvement and in the professional growth and satisfaction of participants and their clients. Let me describe some of these rewards, satisfactions, and values that appear to accompany collaborative efforts:

- Mutual commitment tends to stimulate efforts to resolve differences among participants. A climate develops in which joint planning, national organization, logical allocation of resources, and efficient program operation are encouraged.

- The time and energy spent in collaboration increases mutual respect among participants, fosters openness and ready feedback, and leads to a realistic approach in decision making. The facts and reasons for positions taken, the actual extent of resources available, and the knowledge, skills, attitudes, and priorities of participants are revealed in the processes of planning, decision making, and program operation.

- Authority tends to be established by competence rather than by position, status, or prestige. Policy and program decisions tend to be made on the basis of professional assessment of the merits of various approaches.

- Thoughtful and thorough examination of issues and operational situations is a usual feature of collaborative planning, and collaboration generally enlarges the circle of active participants.

- Collaboration generally results in the making of management decisions and the delegation of responsibility among agencies and individuals on the basis of competence and expertise, rather than power, position, or traditional practice.

- Participants' sense of responsibility is promoted by the openness of collaborative processes. Mutual assessment and self-evaluation become virtually automatic features much as in a competency-based preparation program.

- Collaboration in teacher preparation enhances the likelihood that provisions for internal and external evaluation of programs and their management will be helpful and thorough. The firm commitment of participants promotes their insistence on evaluation processes that will lead to program improvement; it is not likely that evaluation which is inefficient or unrelated to the realities of program settings will be tolerated.

I think that the largely uncoordinated and unilateral approaches to pre- and inservice teacher education that are still commonplace today can be vastly improved by the collaboration of colleges, professional associations, and school administrations. However collaboration in enterprises in which each group has a common interest is not easy to achieve, and the difficulty is increased when that common interest is not the primary function of the collaborating groups. As noted earlier, teacher preparation is a secondary, rather than a primary, function of colleges, professional associations, and common schools — yet the committed and organized contributions of each of these parties is essential to career-long teacher education.

Obviously, collaboration among these three groups will produce many changes in teacher education, and these will depend on the decisions made together by the groups. These changes can be taken in stride, however, because they will be planned and agreed upon by those participating. Collaboration means a sharing of power, sharing in the planning, organization, operation, and evaluation of programs, and sharing in the commitment of resources.

I think there has been sufficient experience with collaboration in teacher education to demonstrate its value. Surely the times are right for a coordinated effort to influence pre- and inservice teacher education. ■

Vehicles For Formulating Policies and Developing Recommendations in a CBTE Program

by Richard E. Collier, Professor and Director
Educational Research and Personnel Development Center
State University College at Buffalo, New York

*The report that follows describes briefly the formal procedures through which policies were formulated and major recommendations were developed during the operation of the Undergraduate Urban Teacher Education Program (UUTEP).**

The UUTEP was initiated in October 1969, under the EPDA planning grant by the New York State Education Department to the State University College at Buffalo — Division of Education and the Lackawanna Board of Education to plan and to operate a total onsite, competency-based training program for undergraduates primarily interested in urban education K-6.

The UUTEP was a comprehensive, cooperative training program which, in addition to featuring a broad-based collaborative effort (the focus of this article), included: total onsite operation of all professional and specialized subject matter requirements; detailed efforts to operationalize a competency-based teacher education program; intensive and extensive staff development program for all essential staff involved, including both school and college personnel; development and implementation of a differentiated staffing pattern for instructional teaming; modularization of all professional instructional components; extensive participation in the community by all teachers-in-training in the program; and a research design and evaluation of UUTEP.

The ultimate success of a program as comprehensive and extensive as UUTEP had to rest on a foundation through which major decisions relative to program operation would be based. It was assumed that continuous, real, broad-based involvement would be the foundation on which such a program would be planned and become operative. With this in mind, two vehicles for formulating policies and developing recommendations were devised.

The first vehicle was the UUTEP Advisory Committee. It concerned itself with the overall operation and major aspects of program implementation. The committee was broadly represented and consisted of the following representation:

	No. of People
• Community (by geographical areas/wards)	6
• UUTEP students (by phase)	3
• Lackawanna Schools (teacher federation, administration, Board of Education, participating teachers, selected members-at-large)	7
• College staff (includes both instructors and administrators)	3
• Program administrators	2
Total	21

Some features of the above: The representatives selected for the Advisory Committee were elected or designated by their constituent groups and were responsible to them where appropriate. However, several key people from both school/community and from the college have served on the committee throughout the operation of the program. They served because of their knowledge of, and unique role they had in, their respective setting.

The Advisory Committee met monthly during the first 3 years, usually in the evening. The meetings would last 2 to 3 hours. Each meeting would have an agenda prepared by program administrators and it was mailed to the membership at least a week prior to the meeting. Notes of each meeting were made and all major action was recorded and distributed to the committee membership. The committee was chaired by the local coordinator for UUTEP, and the UUTEP director served as secretary.

All meetings were conducted by parliamentary procedure and the majority vote of those present determined the final action of the committee. Parity existed between and among all members on the committee. Efforts were made to reach consensus, but that was not possible on a number of occasions.

During the last year of operation of UUTEP, the meetings were scheduled and held during the regular school day. Further, the meeting would rotate among the participating elementary schools. This presented community members of the committee the opportunity to visit and view UUTEP in operation. This feature was both desirable and effective in further helping members of the UUTEP Advisory Committee to internalize and better understand the program.

Some of the actual agenda items may serve to illustrate what the Advisory Committee considered in their review and approval process. These included the rationale for the proposed summer workshop in reading and language arts; the relationship of the proposed UUTEP student calendar to school and college calendars; the criteria and plans for the proposed UUTEP orientation plans; and the rationale for the proposed UUTEP visitation objectives to other schools and school systems.

In summary, the Advisory Committee dealt with global aspects of UUTEP. Their policies and recommendations to the program administrators were advisory. On most occasions the administrative decisions were the same as the recommendations which evolved from the Advisory Committee's actions. The program administrators were responsible for program operation and were accountable to the Advisory Committee when recommendations had to be modified.

The second vehicle for formulating policies and developing recommendations relative to UUTEP was the UUTEP Curriculum Committee. This committee concerned itself with the "substantive" makeup — the "what," "how," and "why" of UUTEP.

The committee consisted of the following representation:

	No. of People
College staff (both instructional and administrative)	4
Lackawanna school personnel (teachers, administrators, and others)	5
UUTEP students (by phase)	3
At-large members (other school or college staff)	2
Program administrators	2
Total	16

(continued on page 5)

* The Lackawanna Board of Education, in a majority vote, opted to terminate their continued participation in UUTEP in July 1973.

Vehicles . . . *(continued)*

Some features of the above: The representatives were selected by their constituent groups and were responsbile to them; the the committee was composed entirely of professional personnel and did not include members from the community; there was minimal overlap in membership with the Advisory Committee; the UUTEP director chaired the Curriculum Committee and conducted the meetings while the local coordinator served as secretary to the committee.

The Curriculum Committee met monthly, usually after school, for approximately 2 hours per meeting. An agenda was prepared by program administrators for each meeting and mailed to the members at least a week prior to the meeting date.

The meeting was conducted by parliamentary procedure with consensus the goal, but votes were taken where essential. Again there was parity among members on the committee, with all votes and major actions of the committee being recorded and mailed to committee members following each meeting.

Typically, the committee would review and approve such items as: major UUTEP course offerings and changes; rationale for UUTEP course offerings and changes; criteria for evaluation of UUTEP visitation schedule; plans and procedures for evaluating UUTEP courses and instructional effectiveness; relationship between and among specific courses and total program; and rationale for needed changes in total program.

In summary, the UUTEP Curriculum Committee would formulate policy and develop major recommendations which the program administrators would implement. However, if changes were essential, the program administrators were responsible for program operation and, as such, could and would implement those decisions as directed, and with opportunity to modify those recommendations as needed.

The UUTEP represented truly collaborative efforts.

The two vehicles for broad-based involvement and participation were both essential and effective in contributing to the successes of UUTEP. Even though the Lackawanna Board of Education has temporarily curtailed participation in the program, the experiences and insights gleaned from the program thus far have been invaluable for those concerned with process and procedures in collaborative decision making in such a setting. It is hoped that the above brief description of the two vehicles for decision making in one CBTE program will share some insight into how other programs might be better planned and implemented as new CBTE programs emerge in the months ahead. ■

A Quiet Competency Revolution

James M. Wallace, Coordinator of Teacher Education
Richard S. Jones, Executive Secretary
Oregon Teacher Standards and Practices Commission

The State of Oregon has, ironically, become quite newsworthy during the last few years through its efforts to avoid publicity. Governor Tom McCall has welcomed visitors to the state, but reminded them that there are already enough permanent residents, and encouraged them to leave following their visits. Proposed state expenditures to encourage tourism are constantly under attack by natives who want Californians to stay home and enjoy the delights of smog and crowded freeways. The James G. Blaine Society warns visitors away with various negative reports about the state, including reminders of the depressing rainfall: "You can always tell when it's summer in Oregon — the rain gets warmer."

Behind these half-serious statements and activities is a genuine conviction that Oregon has been fortunate enough to avoid some of the major crises that afflict large, overpopulated states. Oregon's proximity to California provides a constant reminder of the results of rapid and underplanned growth and development. Thus, although parts of Oregon are beginning to experience excessive growth, the problems are — by comparison with those in most states — still manageable. This is true in most fields — housing, transportation, planning, land use, pollution, human services, and other areas. Because of a combination of luck, location, responsible leadership, and a goodly supply of examples of what *not* to do, Oregon has some lead time as well as powerful motivation to deal with its problems.

Oregon's educational picture parallels that of the general situation. The state has all the difficulties one would encounter in larger states — racial imbalance and conflict, educational inequality, financial problems, inadequate preparation for life and careers, professional power struggles — but they have not reached critical levels. Educators are still able to deal with present and potential problems before being swamped by them. Thus, under the vigorous leadership of an enlightened and vigorous state board and superintendent, actual headway has been made in recent years toward solving some persistent problems.

It would not be an overstatement to describe Oregon's major recent educational developments as the beginnings of a quiet competency revolution. A surprising number of responses to educational needs have been competency-based or at least competency-oriented. These various responses which will be described below have gone on concurrently; not in as orderly a fashion as the description might indicate, but they have built a new base from which further fundamental improvements may be developed.

Probably the keystone in this bridge to educational reform is a set of new school graduation requirements which were adopted by the State Board in September 1972. These new requirements will, according to State Superintendent of Public Instruction, Dale Parnell, "allow districts new alternatives in designing local programs. Some of these alternatives are: credit by examination, off-campus study, multiple approaches to course design, waivers of attendance requirements, and certificates of competency." Whatever the approach used by particular districts, there should be an increased likelihood that students will acquire the competencies needed "to function successfully as producers, consumers, citizens, family members, and learners. 1978 graduates will get diplomas certifying that they have developed competencies to function at survival levels." Implementation of the new requirements is moving forward vigorously, and districts are already submitting plans indicating how they will help students acquire the needed competencies.

It would be incongruous indeed — an ultimately ineffective — to establish competency-based preparation and credentials for students but not for those who teach them and who manage the schools they attend. So, concurrently with work on the graduation requirements, there have been major steps taken to develop competency-based education and certification standards and processes for teachers and administrators. New certification requirements, to be fully implemented by October 1974, provide for certification on the basis of demonstrated competency or course work designed to develop teaching competency. The rules authorize

(Continued on page 6)

the substitution of "successful teaching or administrative experience to satisfy minimal requirements for formal college preparation," and encourage teacher education institutions to "waive all or part of the approved program requirements on a course-by-course basis for individual candidates who demonstrate the competencies which the requirements are intended to develop."

Institutions are now submitting to the Teacher Standards and Practices Commission (the certification and accreditation agency) programs showing how they intend to meet the new rules. As one might expect during this transitional stage, most of the programs are course-based, but each institution is required to draft a policy showing the procedures by which it will waive courses on the basis of demonstrated competency. And some of the colleges are changing significant elements of their program to a competency orientation. Oregon College of Education, for example, found its 1-year trial run so successful that it has moved its entire elementary teacher education program to a competency base.

Also in the new certification rules is a procedure through which administrators may be certified by an Experience Assessment Board, which evaluates candidates' competencies acquired through work, community participation, and related experiences, as well as through the usual academic preparation. This Board has developed workable criteria by which to assess competencies and has applied the criteria with some caution, granting certificates to about one-fourth of the applicants. It is anticipated that the Experience Assessment Board will provide valuable precedents for future efforts in certificating other educational personnel on a competency basis.

Much of the groundwork on the new certification rules had been done by the Teacher Standards and Practices Commission, a group established by the 1965 legislature to advise the State Board on matters related to teacher education and certification. The membership of the Commission included four elementary and four secondary teachers, an elementary and a secondary principal, a county and a city superintendent, a public and a private college representative, and two educators serving at large. The Commission had gradually earned the respect of Oregon educators through the successful completion of a variety of projects and studies, and by 1973 was ready to move beyond its advisory role. With strong support from Superintendent of Public Instruction Dale Parnell, most of the State Board, the Oregon Education Association, the Oregon Federation of Teachers, and other professional groups, the 1973 legislature transferred from the State Board to the Commission responsibility for teacher certification and decertification and for the approval of teacher education programs. In doing so, it modified the composition of the Commission somewhat, dropping the two at-large positions and adding three public members. This will provide for better communication with the public, while still fixing clear responsibility for preparation and licensing on educators themselves. Oregon thus became the first state in which a commission made up predominantly of educators assumed responsibility for professional preparation and licensing.

Oregon educators, legislators, and other citizens are watching the Commission with optimistic interest. Educators realize that they can no longer be absolved of responsibility for the condition of preparation and licensing. As long as the lay Board of Education had authority for these processes, educators could say with some truth that their power to improve certification and teacher education was limited. But now, given a reasonable period of time for the Commission to learn its new role, educators can no longer blame others for any inadequacies which exist in preparation programs and in certification rules and processes. The Commission must now say, in reference to these matters, that "the buck stops here."

Fortunately, what the Board transferred to the Commission was not a crisis, but an opportunity. Oregon's 15 teacher education institutions were doing a reasonably effective job of preparing teachers for the state. Certification rules and procedures were workable, and had undergone substantial improvement under the new regulations described above. Equally important, the Board got the Commission off to an excellent start by adopting, only 2 days before the transfer of authority, three documents which gave the Commission a solid basis from which to undertake its new work. The first of these was a Planning Statement On Educational Personnel Development, growing out of an extensive Commission study and report, which set forth proposed accomplishments and activities for the Board and the Commission in the areas of recruitment and selection, equal opportunity, licensing, preservice and inservice preparation, staffing patterns, evaluation, and "consortium-centered, competency-

(Continued on page 7)

Oregon Governor Tom McCall discusses the new Teacher Standards and Practices Commission bills with (left to right) 1974 Chairman Bruce Stewart, Superintendent of Public Instruction Dale Parnell, and Executive Secretary Richard Jones.

based programs." This last section calls for the preparation of State Department of Education personnel to assist districts and institutions to develop competency-based programs; for the creation of documents and materials needed in implementing such programs; for the adoption of a plan to involve all teacher education institutions in CBTE; and for the establishment of model CBTE programs.

The Planning Statement establishes some long-range goals for the state in CBTE and other areas. Of more immediate impact are two sets of standards for teacher education institutions adopted by the Board the same day. The first, Standards For The Accreditation Of College And University Teacher Education Programs, updates and improves standards that have been in use since the 1950's. It provides for greater involvement of public school personnel, better program orientation to public school needs, more extensive and meaningful field experiences, and greater flexibility in student programs.

The second set, Process Standards For Educational Personnel Development Programs, may be used alternately with the above standards, except that it will apply to new programs or new elements of programs. It is intended to promote and guide the development of competency-based programs centered in consortia formed by colleges, districts, professional organizations, and teacher education students. The Process Standards were developed by the Commission with extensive assistance from a study group that had representation on the consortium model. The study group faced the many difficult questions which must be confronted in competency development and, after much discussion, recommended standards which provide for mutual involvement of at least the four groups noted above, but not for a required exact parity of representation.

Another major decision of the study group was on the definition of competency. The participants finally approved the following: competency is " the demonstrated ability to bring about the expected outcomes of a role or function included in a job definition." The purpose of defining competency in this way was to insure that programs develop not only the usual knowledge and skills in prospective teachers, but also the ability to bring about " desired learning outcomes in children."

The study group, the Commission, and the Board were not being naive in formulating such a demanding and radical definition of competency. They were fully aware of the difficulties in developing teacher education programs which could effectively create and evaluate such competencies. They recognized that initially programs could only begin to do this; but the Standards require that consortia " show the means by which increasing elements of the programs will move to the competency level." Like other parts of the Process Standards, this standard takes an evolutionary approach. The introduction to the Standards sets forth the expectation that there will be " successive approximations to the kinds of teacher education programs ultimately desired " and that " gradual, measurable movement will take place toward the kinds of programs envisioned . . ."

Within a 3-day period, then, the effort of the past several years came to fruition: on June 29 the Board adopted the three documents described above; on July 1 the Commission undertook its new certification and program approval responsibilities, considerably strengthened by the Board's timely action.

The question, of course, is: Where will Oregon go from here with competency development? Although implementation is only beginning, the commitment is too firm for there to be any turning back. Public and legislative pressures for accountability, together with a professional commitment to competency, make it clear that the movement will go forward. Districts, with extensive assistance and encouragement from the State Department of Education, are working to implement the new school graduation requirements, and the Commission is vigorously promoting CBTE. It is helping to develop CBTE training plans for educational personnel, supporting a Baseline Study to ascertain the current level of CBTE throughout the state, seeking foundation support for statewide implementation plans, and providing assistance to programs which are beginning to develop consortia. In these and other ways, the Commission is trying to assure that CBTE receives at least a fair trial.

Teacher education programs are also working on CBTE in various ways. Both public and private institutions are identifying elements of their programs which are amenable to competency development. Some are planning the transition from advisory groups to consortia as specified in the Process Standards. Professional organizations are beginning the serious study of CBTE and what it will mean to them. There is some initial skepticism concerning CBTE because of its links with the accountability movement, but it is expected that the advantages of true involvement in teacher education and certification will overcome the reluctance that professional organizations may have toward participation.

The competency movement tries to look beyond courses, credits, and experiences, and to focus on outcomes. It is thus appropriate to conclude this article by projecting what the outcomes of the current competency movement may be in Oregon. One can reasonably predict that by 1980, the following milestones will have been reached:

1) All school districts will be operating under approved plans showing how they meet the new competency-oriented graduation requirements.

2) At least two classes of students will have graduated from programs meeting the new requirements, and will thus have demonstrated that they have the minimal competencies identified as needed for survival in America's complex society.

3) All 15 teacher education institutions will be operating programs which meet new certification rules, including provisions for demonstrating competency in lieu of course completion.

4) Guidelines and other materials will have been produced, field-tested, and utilized to assist in the development of competency-based teacher education programs which meet the Process Standards.

5) Consortia of colleges, districts, professional organizations, and teacher education students will have been established in connection with each teacher education institution.

6) Each teacher education program in the state will be involved in CBTE development at some level, and several will have established full-fledged CBTE programs.

7) A major documentation and evaluation of CBTE development in Oregon will have been completed, and plans for next steps made on the basis of that evaluation.

During the remainder of this decade, Oregon teachers have an unusual opportunity to see if they can do what lay groups have thus far been able to do only incompletely and inadequately — to improve the processes of teacher education, licensing, and performance so that they make a significant difference in the ways children learn and grow. Throughout the country, educators have been clamoring for the autonomy and responsibility which would enable them to effectively improve preparation for and entry into teaching. In Oregon they now have these powers. Hard work, continuous cooperation, and a steady focus upon the needs of students will all be required for success, but there is currently every indication that Oregon is moving to integrate competency, accountability, and professional responsibility in a way that should effectively improve the education of Oregon's young people.

Editorial

This special theme issue of PBTE focuses on what many people consider to be an essential element in any competency-based program — *collaboration*. We recognize that collaborative efforts do exist apart from competency-based teacher education, and vice-versa; our interest, however, is directed to those areas in which the two are related.

We have secured for our readers a variety of articles pertaining to this theme. The diagnostic test on page 1, we believe, provides an excellent focus for readers to gauge their own perceptions in this area. Wendell C. Allen, formerly Assistant Superintendent of Teacher Education and Certification (now retired) for the State of Washington and nationally known for his commitment to the collaborative development of programs, presents a strong case for the benefits of collaborative efforts. In addition, the articles on the Oregon Commission and the Lackawanna project describe differing approaches to collaborative structures for the governance of teacher education and certification.

Underlying the concept of collaboration is a value belief that decisions about teacher education (or even all education) can no longer rest with any single agency — parties affected by a system must be involved in the policy decisions affecting that system. And it is through this value screen that the problems and potentials of collaboration should be viewed.

MULTI-STATE CONSORTIUM ON PERFORMANCE-BASED TEACHER EDUCATION

STATE	*REPRESENTATIVE*
Washington	Edwin L. Lyle
Oregon	James Wallace
Utah	Roger C. Mouritsen
Arizona	John Potts
Texas	Tom T. Walker
Minnesota	Patricia J. Goralski
Vermont	Robert Vail
New York	Vincent C. Gazzetta
Florida	Nell Kannwischer
New Jersey	Ward Sinclair

Administering State: New York

Project Director
Theodore E. Andrews
New York State Education Department
Albany, New York 12210

Stuart E. Dean
United States
Office of Education Representative

Syracuse University Coordinator
James Collins

Editor
Theodore E. Andrews

Funded
by
United States Office of Education
Title V, Section 505, Grant
and
Syracuse University Projects
Supported
by
Teacher Corps
and
National Center For the Improvement
of Educational Systems

BUREAU OF TEACHER EDUCATION
STATE EDUCATION DEPARTMENT
ALBANY, NEW YORK 12234

Brenda Greenhowe
One Dupont Circle
Suite 610
Washington, D.C. 20036